

The Bishop of Rapho's Letter, About Drinking to the Me- mory of King William



The Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, But Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost.

Rom. 14. 17.

An Account of the following Publication.

After that the Custom of Drinking to the Memory of King William (as it is accounted for in the following Letter) had for about Eleven Years generally obtained among us; In all which time, altho' many very justly resented the wicked Extravagance which some few Men, in their Cups, were said to have joined with it; Yet either no Man so much as suspected the thing in it self to be a Sin, or, if he did, gave no notice of this his suspicion to the World: At last my Lord Bishop of Cork was pleased to publish two Books, in which he not only taxes this practice as being in it self sinful under the Gospel; But at last runs his charge up, thro' many very harsh Expressions, even to that of no less than the Crime of Idolatry.

As soon as I heard of his design to publish the former of these Books; I earnestly entreated him that before he laid such a heavy, as well as new, Imputation, in Print, upon the generality of Protestants, and those as well of the Clergy as the Laity; He would first communicate his Notions unto some of his Brethren the Bishops; Of whom about the number of twelve (as I remember) were at that time in Dublin. His Lordship gave me some Reasons (which I own did not satisfy me) why he would take no farther Advice in the Matter than what he had already done; And at the same time told me, that if he were in the wrong, he would take it very kindly from me, if I would publish a fair Answer to his Book when it came out: Since the only thing that he aimed at was that Truth might appear in its clearest light.

When I had read the Book, I freely told his Lordship that I thought he had not at all proved his Point; neither had he made it out that the drinking we are speaking of was, in it self (and abstracting from the abuses that some wicked Men perhaps run into) a transgression of any Law of God; Whereas Sin is nothing else but the transgression of the Law, 1 Joh. 3. 4. And where no Law is, there is no transgression, Rom. 4. 15.

After two or three Conferences upon this Subject; His Lordship seeming desirous that I would give him my thoughts in writing; I accordingly set them down; and pressed the Objection (as I thought I well might) which I had grounded upon the two Texts of Holy Scripture above mentioned; Always telling him that by the word Law we were to understand not only the express Letter, but also the design and intention of any Law of God: After which to find a quite

contrary;

contrary Interpretation of my Objection in his Lordship's Second Book, was matter of no small surprize to me. His Lordship's words (pag. 51) are these : Another objection and the last which I shall consider at length, is this, Where there is no law there is no transgression. i. e. There is no EXPRESS POSITIVE Law which says thou shalt not drink in remembrance of K. W-m, &c. And after he has told us that he will consider this objection at length ; Yet for a FULL Answer to it, and exposing the shameful weakness of it, his Lordship refers Reader to his Discourse of Healths in general, then ready for the Press, but not yet published. pag. 53. Marg.

I confess I had not so bad an Opinion of my objection as his Lordship seemed to have ; and being not at all satisfied with his way either of stating or answering it ; I resolved to consider it over again ; and having drawn up my thoughts of it in the following Letter, I shewed it to five or six Persons of Judgment and Piety, that they might correct my mistakes, if any I had committed ; And when I found that they made no objection to what I had written, I gave a Copy of it into my Lord Bishop of Cork's own hand ; being very desirous to know his Lordship's farther thoughts concerning so important a Matter as a charge of Idolatry, and that of so many years continuance amongst almost all the Protestants of this Kingdom, and perhaps many more of the Neighbouring ones.

Not many days after, His Lordship was pleased to press me to print my Letter, without which he thought he could not take that liberty that might otherwise be proper in the Answering of it : I refused indeed to print the Letter, as not seeing any necessity for it ; But as for full liberty in the Answering of it, I freely gave it to his Lordship, with these two Provisoos ; First, That he would represent my Sense in my own Words ; or at least give it all the same force that I myself had given it : And Secondly, That he would forbear all reflections on my Person.

His Lordship, either then, or at our next meeting, told me that he had lent my Letter to several Persons, who he supposed had taken Copies of it : And when he himself had thus helped to make it publick ; As he ought not in reason now to complain of it, so did I not then think myself obliged to make any secret of it : And therefore whereas before this I had shewn it only to a very few of my Friends, I afterwards was something more free in the Communication of it, until at last it came to be the discourse of a pretty many People.

Sometime after this, His Lordship sent me a Message by a Reverend and worthy Divine, importing me again to print the Letter ; To whom I returned the same answer as before I had given his Lordship : And whereas I had been informed that his Lordship thought I had used him not with that Decency as became both his and my Character ; I desired the same Revd. Person to assure him that as I never had the least design in any word of that Paper to cast any reflection on his Person ; so if any expression that seemed to look that way had unwarily escaped me, I would wait on his Lordship, and alter it with my own Hand, if he thought fit to publish the Letter, together with an answer to it.

After this I heard nothing of the matter, and indeed it seemed to be asleep, until yesterday in the Evening his Lordship was pleased to send me his answer in Print, Which in the midst of abundance of business ; I have not as yet time to read : But being told that his Lordship therein presses me to publish my Letter without altering one word, as I gave the Copy to him ; I have resolved to comply with him ; And submit all that I have said to the Judgment of every candid Reader ; Desiring only this one thing from him, that he would not censure or condemn me, until he has read and fairly considered my own words as they stand connected with the whole Letter.

May, 21. 1715.

Edw. Rapho.

The Copy of my Letter which I gave my Lord Bishop of Cork being returned to me by his Lordship very much worn and broken in many places, I was forced to give the Printer another Copy, which I believe is word for word the same, to set the Press by : Or it there should happen to be a Syllable difference between them, As it is without the least design, so am I well assured that it makes no manner of alteration in the Sense.

S I R,

S I R,

I Have read my Lord Bishop of *Cork's Second Part*, and have exactly the same opinion of it, as I had of the *First*. An *Image* of a Sin may be so artificially framed, frightfully clad, and placed in an obscure light of hard or ambiguous words, Terms of Art, and intricate Arguments ; as at the first sight to startle even a wise Man. But bring it once into a clear Light, and try it fairly by a just Rule, and it will require no great depth of Reason to discover, that it is but a Delusion.

The only Rule whereby tryal is to be made of a Sin, is *God's Laws*. For Sin is nothing else, but *the transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. And *where no Law is there is no transgression*, Rom. 4. 15. And by the word LAW, we understand, not only the express Letter (as his Lordship wou'd put upon us, p. 51.) but the *design* of the Law ; that is to say, *all that God intended in making the Law*, as far as we are able to come to the knowledge of it. And whatever is no way contrary to the *design* of the Law, we may with all Assurance conclude to be no Sin.

If drinking to the Memory of K. William (as it is commonly practised) is not any way contrary to the *design* of that Law, whereby Christ instituted the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, there is no other Law of God, of which it can be pretended, to be a Transgression, and consequently, it can be no Sin ; I mean, *in its self*, and except it be perverted and abused to some evil purpose.

He that wou'd make an *impartial* tryal of any action, whether or no it be a Sin, must first set that Law of God, by which he wou'd try it, in as clear and full a light, as he can ; that is to say, he must fully and fairly set forth the *design* of the Law. And when that is once done, it will presently appear, whether from that Law, it can be concluded, that such or such an action is a Sin.

For every voluntary action, that hinders, or any way obstructs the *design* of any Law of God, is a transgression of that Law, and therefore a Sin. But an action that is altogether *consistent with the design* of the Law, neither is, nor can be a *transgression* of it, and therefore is no Sin.

Whether the *words* of a Divine Law, be Positive or Negative, yet the *design* of it, may be, and I believe always is, both to *command* some things, and *forbid* others.

By the *design* of that Law, whereby Christ Instituted the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, we are *commanded* ; First, to keep up a constant and lasting remembrance of his Death and Passion, and of the Benefits we receive thereby : Secondly, devoutly, reverently and thankfully to receive that Bread and that Cup, which he has appointed ; and in the manner that he has appointed them ; thereby to keep up that remembrance, or to *shew the Lord's death*, as St. Paul expresses it, 1 Cor. 11. 26. And Thirdly, to receive the Bread and the Cup, not only as a *remembrance* of his Death, but also as the Communion of his Body and Blood, 1 Cor. 10. 16. That is to say, as the means ordain'd by God, whereby we should communicate in, or partake of the benefits of that Passion, which he underwent by the Crucifixion of his Body, and the shedding of his Blood for us. He, who sincerely and conscientiously performs these three things, does all that is *commanded* by the full *design* of this Law.

Where a Divine Law forbids nothing in *express terms*, we have but one only Rule to guide us into the prohibiting part of it ; which is, that *whatsoever is inconsistent with the due performance of what the Law commands, must always be supposed to be forbidden by the design of it*. But if I duly perform all that such a Law commands, and do nothing that is

any way inconsistent with such performance: I cannot be said to do any thing which that Law forbids, nor can any action of mine be, *by that Law*, condemned as a sin.

Now the Law whereby Christ instituted his Holy Supper *commands* indeed several things, as I have already said, but *forbids nothing* in expresse Terms. If therefore we wou'd know whether drinking to the Memory of K. Wm. be *by this Law* to be condemn'd as a Sin, we have but one way for it; and that is, to consider well, whether there be any thing in such drinking, that is *inconsistent* with the due performance of what that Law *commands*. For if notwithstanding our drinking to the memory of K. Wm. we may yet duly perform all that is *commanded* by that Law; our so drinking can never be justly lookt upon as *forbidden* even by the *design* of it: And as for the expresse Letter of the Law, it is not here so much as pretended.

If even without drinking, we remember'd K. W. as *dying to redeem us from Sin*, this wou'd indeed be *inconsistent* with that remembrance which we ought to have of Christ our *only Redeemer*, in the holy Communion. But when we remember him only as God's instrument for our deliverance from Popery and Slavery, and as one, who so often ventured even his Life for our Safety and Security, and also wish that his glorious Memory may be immortal; or that he may be had in *everlasting remembrance*, Psal. 112. 6. What is there in this, that shou'd hinder a Man from coming with a good Conscience to Gods holy Table?

Or when we drink to K. W.-m's Memory: If we had the least thought or intention of mimicking the holy Communion in any of the expressions or circumstances, that are us'd in the celebration of it, or comparing or likening that blessed Sacrament only to our common eating or drinking; this wou'd be *inconsistent* with that *devotion* and *reverence*, which the holiness of this Ordinance requires from us. But since the least design of this sort never once yet enter'd into the heart of Man, until perhaps my Lord Bishop of Cork's Book may, contrary to his own intentions, have put it into the minds of some Irreligious and Atheistical persons; why may not a Man at his Table drink a Glass of Wine to the Memory of K. W. and yet when he goes to Church receive the holy Communion with that reverence and devotion, that becomes a good Christian?

It has been taken up as a common custom (neither is it contrary to any Law of God, if it be not otherwise abused or perverted) to drink a Glass of Liquor *as a mark or token of a Man's sincerity* when he wishes *health* to another; and this is what is meant by *drinking any ones health*, as it is usually stil'd, In imitation of this, it has been brought in to drink in the same manner when a Man wishes *continuance* and *prosperity* to a Church, Kingdom, Commonwealth, City, &c. or *success* to any Design or Enterprize, that is on foot: For which reason such drinking is also vulgarly, tho' not so properly, call'd drinking of a *health*. And when some Men began to vilify and asperse K. W. after his death, more openly and barefacedly, than they durst to do, while he was alive; others on the contrary thought themselves obliged by all proper ways to assert and vindicate his Memory: Upon which occasion it was also taken up as a custom to drink a Glass of Liquor *as a token of reality and sincerity* when Men wish'd well to the Memory of K. W. or to those who lov'd and honour'd him: And this also pass'd by the common name of *drinking a health* (about the propriety of which expression, I think the Criticks need give themselves no great trouble). And as long as all this was done with sobriety and modesty, and without any unquiet or uncharitable design; it was never thought a Sin by any one (that I can hear of) before his Lordship; but on the contrary was, and is still practis'd by Men of the greatest Piety and Judgment. But as for its being a profanation of the holy Communion; it was so little dreamt of, that when his Lordship first started that strange and groundless notion; it struck many sober Men even with Horror, to find that sacred Ordinance of God so debased, as to be forcibly brought into a comparison with an ordinary custom, which Men had taken up in their common drinking.

The Moral Law, tho' transcribed into the Holy Bible, yet originally is the *law of reason*, and *written in the heart* of Man, as every Mans *Conscience* who thinks soberly will presently

ly bear witness, Rom. 2. 15. And altho' our obligation to observe and keep this Law, is farther enforced, by that Revelation, which God has made of himself ; yet originally, and in the nature of things it is antecedent to all Revelation, or positive Institution whatsoever. Supposing then, that we had lived before the Preaching of the Gospel in the World ; and it had been a custom then amongst us to drink to the Memory of any great or good Man, in the very same manner as now we do to K. W. is there any Branch or Sanction of the *Moral Law* (under which alone we then must have been) whereby this wou'd have been made a Sin ? Or in other terms, wou'd there *then* have been any immorality in such an action. His Lordship plainly supposes (Pt. 2. pag. 24. 35.) and the thing is evident in it felt ; that there wou'd not. If then an action which in it felt has no *immorality*, is by reason of any *positive Institution*, become a Sin ; Let us hear what proof can be brought for it.

It is alledged that drinking to the memory of K. W. is *drinking in remembrance* of him, who is *departed this World* ; and that the action of drinking in remembrance of such a Person, is by command and institution of Christ, made a part of Divine Worship, and appropriated to Christ himself : And herein the *Profaness*, and no less than *Idolatry* of drinking to the Memory of K. W. is placed ; viz. because the action [of drinking to his Memory] is the same [with that of drinking in remembrance of Christ] and the persons [of Christ and K. W.] infinitely different, Pt. 2. pag. 41. l. 22. From whence the inference must be, that to drink to the memory of K. W. is forbidden by the very *design* of that Law, whereby the Lord's-Supper is instituted. But on the contrary, if drinking to the memory of K. W. is *not at all the same action* with that of our drinking in remembrance of Christ, which he himself has instituted and appointed, then all the reasoning, which is intirely built upon this Pillar must fall to the ground. Let us therefore fairly and candidly examine this point, whether these two actions are the same, as it is pretended they are. I do not mean the same *numerical* or single Action ; for in that sense no two actions can be one or the same : But in this Controversy, when we say the *same Action*, we mean the *same sort or kind of Action*.

First then two Actions are not to be reckoned the *same* or of the *same sort*, because they are, or may be called by the *same name*. The Signification of words is not necessary, but altogether Arbitrary, and one and the same word may be, and sometimes is, applied to things or actions very different. Thus for Example, I honour God, and I honour the King, but not with the same sort of honour. I drink in remembrance of Christ in the Holy Communion ; and when I drink a Health to my absent Friend, you may as well call that a *drinking in remembrance of him* as when I drink to the memory of K. W. nor is it unusual at the drinking of a Friend's Health to say, *come remembering such an one*. And yet to drink of the Cup in the Holy Communion, was never by any good Christian reckoned to be an action of the *same kind* with drinking a Friend's Health. Altho' therefore it is a Dispute only about Words, to debate, whether drinking to the memory of K. W. (as I have described it) may be *call'd* a drinking in remembrance of him ; yet granting it to be so, it is still no less than Blasphemy, to say that the *Action* of drinking in the Holy Communion instituted by Christ, is the *same*, or of the *same sort* with that Customary one of drinking to K. W.—*m's* Memory.

Secondly, Two *Human Actions*, (for of such we are speaking) are not to be reckoned the *same*, because of the agreement that is between the outward and bodily part of 'em. I honour God by kneeling and bowing my Body ; I bow also and kneel in honour to the King : And yet the [intire] Action, that I perform to the King is by no means to be accounted the *same* with what I perform to God ; because the part which my mind bears, is vastly different in one of those Actions, from what it is in the other. Altho' therefore we *drink*, when we receive the Holy Communion, and *drink* also to the memory of K. W.—*m*, yet our reception of the Cup in that blessed Sacrament, is not an action of the *same sort* with our drinking upon the other occasion, because the *whole intent, purpose, design, end, and meaning* of the one, is far from being the *same* with what it is in the other. But

But Thirdly, when there is not only an outward and bodily agreement between two Actions, but the *mind* also acts in the same manner in the performance of 'em both; so far as the *mind* thus acts in the same manner, and no farther, are these two Actions (considered as *Human*) to be look'd upon as the *same*, or of the *same sort*. I kneel to God and pray, that he wou'd give me my daily Bread: I kneel also (suppose) to my Prince, and pray him to bestow something on me whereby I may subsist: These Actions have a very great bodily Resemblance; and yet (consider'd as *Human*) they are not at all of the *same sort*. But if I shou'd go into my retirement and direct a Prayer to the King, when my words cou'd no way come unto him, this wou'd be an Action of the *same sort* with Prayer to God, altho' directed to a wrong object. Prayer to God is an *immediate directing of our thoughts to him, who knows the secrets of our Hearts*: And if I make use of words in such a Prayer, it may be necessary to fix my own attention, or raise my devotion, but cannot (if I have a right notion of the Divine Nature) be ever intended to convey my thoughts to him, who already perfectly knows 'em. But the King knows nothing of my thoughts until they are signify'd unto him; and therefore if I pray to him in words, or offer him my Petition in writing, I pray to him as to a *Man*, but if I offer a Prayer to him, when the sound or sense of my words can no way come at him; this is an *immediate direction of my thoughts to him, as unto one, who knows the secrets of my Heart, and in Fact, an ascribing of Divine Perfection to him*; and consequently in reality, I pray to him, not as unto a *Man*, but as to a *God*. And this is a very just reason, why we absolutely condemn all that invocation of the Saints departed, which is practis'd in the Church of *Rome*. For to say nothing of the great extravagance of some of their Addressees, especially unto the Blessed Virgin; we have no manner of assurance, that the sense of our words or expressions is any way convey'd to the Saints, and if we *immediately direct our thoughts to them in Prayer*, altho' it were no more but an *orate pro nobis*, yet this wou'd so far be a praying to them, not as to *Creatures*, but to *Gods*, as it necessarily supposes them to know the secrets of our Hearts, which God has reserv'd to himself alone.

But to return from this digression: The bodily action of drinking is of the *same sort* in an Ox as in a Man; but considering it as a *Human Action*, in which the mind bears its part, as well as the Body; at one time a Man in obedience to *Christ's Command* eats Bread and drinks Wine, both blessed and distributed, in remembrance of his Death for us, and as the Communion of his Body and Blood. At another in compliance with a receiv'd custom he barely drinks a glass of liquor as a token of his sincerity, when he professes to wish well to the memory of K. W. or to those who lov'd him, and still have an honourable remembrance of him. Now setting aside the bare common Name of drinking in remembrance, (which if given to the later, must be for a reason quite different from that, for which Christ gives it to the former) and the outward agreement in the bodily Action of drinking, (Neither of which as I have shewn, ought to be taken into the present comparison) what is there that remains in these two Actions (considered as *Human*) that shou'd make them the *same*, or of the *same sort*? Neither the design, nor the manner of performance, nor the temper and disposition of Mind are the *same* in them; how comes it to pass then that the Actions themselves, shou'd yet be the *same*? And if they are not the *same*, nor of the *same sort*, but altogether of different kinds, consider'd as *Human Actions*, notwithstanding a little forced Resemblance, that is artificially made between them in outward appearance: It will by no means follow, that because *Christ has appropriated* [eating and] drinking in remembrance of his [Death or] departure out of this World [to be perform'd] to himself [in such a particular and peculiar manner,] therefore it must not be Lawful [after another sort, and in another manner, as well as for a reason altogether different] to drink to the memory of K. W.; only because this may be called [in some sort] a drinking in remembrance of a person departed this World. If his Lordship cannot find a difference between that Action of drinking in remembrance of a person departed this World, which is apply'd to Christ in the Holy Sacrament, and that which, [in quite another manner,] is apply'd to K. W. (as he professes

esses Pr. 2. pag. 29.) I cannot but admire, what is become of that accuracy of thought, which I have often had occasion to observe in him : Neither do I believe, that ever there was one Man in the World, who *acknowledged*, or so much as thought, that the *Very same Action, which is to be done to Christ, as God, may be done to K. W. as Man* ; which yet his Lordship (p. 23. 24.) indifferently charges upon all who maintain the lawfulness of drinking to the memory of *K. W.*

But we are told that to drink [any way] in remembrance of a person departed in this World, is a *Sacramental Action*, and that the very *essence* or *essential form* of the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper consists in this very remembrance. What our Church means by the word *Sacrament* she has told us in her Catechism ; but as for a *Sacramental Action* which is not a compleat Sacrament, and yet has the *very essence*, or *essential form* of one ; and indeed the *essence* or *essential form* of any thing, especially of what has no being at all but from *positive institution* ; are Notions too hard for plain Men to take as a rule for Conscience, and whereby to determine what is or is not a Sin, which, as I have already said, can only be determin'd by the Law of God.

Instead therefore of these difficult Terms, his Lordship (p. 45.) is content to substitute others that are more Intelligible ; and gives us to understand, that his meaning is, that the *Remembrance of a person departed this World, is the chief end, intent, purpose, or design of that Holy Sacrament* : And still (says he) *the Profaness and Idolatry will be the same to apply that, which is the chief end, intent, purpose or design of that Holy Sacrament to a meere Man, as to apply that which is Essential to it.*

Whether the words *end, intent, purpose, and design*, are a just and sufficient Explication of *essence* and *essential form*, I will not now dispute : But if his Lordship had consider'd, that plain distinction of the Logicians between *Dictum simpliciter* and *Dictum secundum quid* ; he had easily avoided that mistake upon which both his first and second part are wholly built. Let us suppose, that the *chief end, intent, purpose, or design of the Holy Sacrament is to remember [Jesus Christ as] a person that [died for our Sins, and] is departed this world* : To apply that remembrance to any one, but Christ himself (whether with drinking, or without it) I readily grant to be a Sin. But leave out the words, which I have included within Hooks, and then take the Doctrine simply and nakedly (as it only can serve his Lordship's purpose) and it is not at all true. For if this proposition, as it is nakedly and interminately set down, be true, *viz.* that the *chief end, intent, purpose and design of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper is to remember a person departed this World* ; then it will follow, that if in the celebration of the Sacrament I intend to remember, and accordingly do remember a person departed this World (no matter who he is, or whether he died for our sins or not) I fulfil the *chief end, intent, purpose and design* of the Sacrament. And thus the foundation upon which all his Lordship's reasoning is intirely built, appears most plainly to be only a common fallacy. But besides all this, it may be said, that altho' in the Holy Communion, we eat and drink in remembrance of Christ, yet this remembrance is not [it self] the *chief end, or design* of such our eating and drinking ; but is to be directed to a farther end and purpose, namely, the *Communion of his Body and Blood*, or the Participation of the merits of his Death and Passion in order to our Salvation. Which further shews the greatness of his Lordship's mistake in affirming the *Action* to be the same. When we drink to the memory of King William, as when we drink in the Holy Sacrament.

But if Men shou'd as ordinarily eat bread as they drink Wine to the Memory of *K. W.* wou'd not this be shocking ?

I answer, that if this were in the least designed to mimick the holy Sacrament, and consequently to bring contempt upon it, I have already said, that such an action wou'd be a Sin. But if without the least thoughts of the Sacrament, it had grown into a common custom to eat as it has to drink a health to a friend ; and upon this alone occasion had been taken to eat also, as it has been to drink, to the Memory of *K. W.* there wou'd have been nothing more unlawful or shocking in the one, than now there is in the other.

But

But is it not at least doubtful, whether it be lawful to drink to the Memory of K. W. ? And ought we not to abstain from an indifferent action, if we doubt of the lawfulness of it?

I answer, that he, who is under such a doubt ought to abstain : And he who doubts not, should yet take care not to give offence to weak Christians. But where a Man is well inform'd, and under no such doubt, I see not why, he should abstain from that any more, than any other indifferent action ; except there be some one present, who takes offence at it.

But if any Man makes use of such drinking, in order to promote either Intemperance or faction ; there is no sober Christian, but will detest and abhor such practice.

I know no difficulty in either of his Lordship's Books, but what, upon the Principles above insisted on, may very easily be solved. But this I shall leave to your own reason ; and shall only add the grave as well as witty reflection, made by a Gentleman upon this occasion, viz. That if we carefully abstain from all those things, which God has made Sins, we need not be much concern'd about this new Sin of my Lord Bishop of Cork's making. I am,

Sir,

6 DE 58

Yours, &c.

P. S.

Give me your opinion of this Syllogism, made according to that of the Bishop of Cork (p. 40). *No action which by command or institution of Christ, is made a part of Divine Worship, can without Idolatry be apply'd to a meer Man. But the action of begging forgiveness from him, against whom we have trespassed, & by Command and Institution of Christ (in the Lord's Prayer) made a part of Divine Worship. Therefore the action of begging forgiveness, &c. cannot without Idolatry be apply'd to a meer Man.* The same argument may be brought against a poor impotent Man's begging his daily Bread from his rich Neighbours ; or a Man's beseeching his Companion not to lead or bring him into any Temptation. And tho' to keep a day holy to God be by Divine Institution, a part of that Worship we are to pay to him ; yet I think there is no Sin, and much less Idolatry, in observing or keeping holy those Festival Days, which are dedicated to the Memory of the Apostles. And if any Man is resolv'd to call this a *keeping days holy to Peter, Paul, &c.* we need not wrangle about the signification of words which is arbitrary, it is enough to me, that the meaning is altogether different from that of keeping a day holy to God.

ADVERTISEMENT.

There will soon be published, *The Rule of Self-Examination ; Or, the only way of Banishing Doubts, and Scruples ; And directing the Conscience in the Satisfactory Practice of all Christian Duties.* By Edward Lord Bishop of Rapho

Dublin, Printed for J. Popyar, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1715.

